

**REMARKS**

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the rejection dated July 6, 2005. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1, 2, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geyer et al. (US 6,249,110). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, “[a] power supply apparatus, comprising: a first power supply circuit, … an output voltage terminal; and … the first power supply circuit further detecting voltage at the output terminal.” (Emphasis added.) Geyer et al. does not disclose this limitation. Geyer et al. discloses “potential difference must be established between the output voltages of in-phase regulator LR and the switched-mode regulator. This potential difference is maintained when an in-phase regulator with a 5 V output is used and the control voltage of switched-mode regulator SR is set at 5.3 V. Then in the normal case, the output voltage is 0.3 V higher than the control voltage of in-phase regulator LR.” Col. 3, ln. 12-20. There is no detection of the output voltage by the LR circuit. The difference in output voltages is predetermined when the control voltages of the LR and SR circuits are preset when the circuit is initially configured. Since Geyer et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claims 1 and 16, claims 1 and 16 are not anticipated by Geyer et al. Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, and 16 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geyer et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-5 depend on claim 1 and

should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 3-5 be withdrawn.

Claims 6-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geyer et al. in view of Hiraki et al. (US 2002/0041178). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 6-9 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-9 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geyer et al. in view of Manabe et al. (US 6,236,194). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 10-11 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 10-11 be withdrawn.

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geyer et al. in view of Hiraki et al and further in view of Manabe et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 12-15 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 12-15 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371  
Rachael Lea Leventhal  
Registration No.: 54,266  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
(202) 785-9700  
Attorneys for Applicants